Abdul K. Hassan, Esq. Attorney and Counselor at Law

215-28 Hillside Avenue, Queens Village, New York 11427 Phone: 718-740-1000 Fax: 718-468-3894 Email: abdul@abdulhassan.com

Via ECF

March 17, 2011

Hon. Ramon E. Reyes, USMJ United States District Court, EDNY 225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, NY 11201

Re: Joseph Daniels v. 1710 Realty LLC
Civil Action #: 10-CV-0022 (DGT)(RER)
Letter Brief in Support of Plaintiff's Proposed Exhibits

Dear Magistrate-Judge Reyes:

I represent Plaintiff Joseph Daniels in the above-referenced action and hereby submit the instant memorandum of law on his behalf to address the evidentiary objections raised by Defendant in the pre-trial order. The bench trial before your Honor is scheduled to begin on April 6, 2011. Exhibits 1, 2, 5, and 6 are attached hereto and are addressed below.

As laid out below, some of the proposed exhibits and objections deal with the equitable tolling issue. In its opposing brief at page 3, Defendant cited the Second Circuit case of <u>Johnson v. Nyack Hospital.</u>, 86 F.3d 8, 12 (2d Cir. 1996), and stated that, "Equitable tolling allows courts to extend the statute of limitations beyond the time of expiration as necessary to avoid inequitable circumstances." Defendant went on to argue that, "equitable tolling is unnecessary because plaintiff commenced this action within a few months of his last wage payment, well

1

within the two-year statute of limitations period." (Def. Opp. Mem. at 3). This reasoning by Defendant actually benefits Plaintiff when we correct for the time when an FLSA claim accrues. Under the FLSA overtime liability accrues on a weekly basis and each workweek stands alone – see 29 CFR 778.104, 105, 106. As such, assuming that Plaintiff began work in April 1994, the SOL for overtime worked during the first month of work would expire in April 1996 or April 1997 – depending on whether we use a two or three year SOL (a three year SOL applies) and the tolling would begin in 1996 or 1997 and not from the date of Plaintiff's termination as Defendant seems to argue. Because it is more common for lawyers and judges to deal with claims that accrue on a single date, the fact that FLSA claims accrue weekly is often missing from a lot of equitable tolling analysis and when we correct for this error even Defendant's own logic would warrant tolling for the entire period of Plaintiff's employment. Plaintiff also seeks equitable tolling as a sanction as explained below. For these as well as the reasons that follow, all of Plaintiff's proposed exhibits should be admitted into evidence.

#### 1. THE GOOGLE MAP RESULTS ARE ADMISSIBLE

During his deposition, Plaintiff testified that he drove his wife to work during his half-hour lunch break. Defense counsel at one of the court conferences, and at other times, argued that this round trip could not be completed in half hour. This issue is material because it affects the number of work hours that Plaintiff can be compensated for. Among the evidence Plaintiff intends to introduce at trial are results from Google Maps (see Exhibit 2 hereto) showing that the distance between Plaintiff's job site and that of his wife is only about four miles and at a very slow rate of driving of 20 mph, the round trip can take only about 12-13 mins – a time which can be even less given that Plaintiff made this journey at 2:30PM instead of during rush hour. In the pre-trial order, "Defendant objects to the admissibility of plaintiff's exhibit 2 (Google Maps

results) based upon relevance, authentication, and hearsay." These objections can be quickly rejected because this Court can easily take judicial notice of the Google Maps results. In this regard, the court in <u>United States v. Sessa</u>, 2011 WL 256330, at 25 n. 12 (E.D.N.Y., 2011), stated in relevance part as follows:

The distance was calculated by reference to Google Maps. See http://maps.google.com/maps [last checked January 23, 2011]. A court may take judicial notice of facts that are "capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." Fed.R.Evid. R. 201(b). "Courts commonly use internet mapping tools to take judicial notice of distance and geography." Rindfleisch v. Gentiva Health Systems, Inc., No. 10-CV-2111, 2010 WL 3980182, at \*11 n. 13 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 8, 2010).

In addition, the Google Maps results qualify as a commercial publication and are admissible as an exception to hearsay under FRE 803(17). As to authentication, the map results are self-authenticating under FRE 902(6) and (7) especially where they contain an imprint of the Google web address and the date that the Google site published the results. Moreover, Plaintiff's counsel hereby represents to the Court that he entered the two addresses in the exhibit in Google Maps and the results were printed and a true, complete, accurate and correct copy of those results constitute Exhibit 2. Of course, because we are asking the Court to take judicial notice, and given the wide use and acceptability of Google Maps, the Court (as well as Defendant) can examine the Google Maps website to confirm the authenticity and accuracy of the results in Exhibit 2. We can even do this demonstration in the courtroom. For all the foregoing reasons, the Google Maps results are also admissible under the residual hearsay exception – FRE 807.

### 2. THE POSTER-RELATED EXHIBITS ARE ADMISSIBLE

In the pre-trial order, "Defendant objects to the admissibility of plaintiff's exhibits 1, 5 and 6 based upon relevance and authentication." Exhibit 1 is the purported wage poster, Exhibit 5 is Defendant's Supplemental Rule 26 Disclosure and accompanying email concerning purported wage poster and witness Aron Sicherman, and Exhibit 6 is a letter from defense counsel in response to Judge Trager's order about purported poster (defendant should have produced an affidavit from someone other than counsel). In terms of authentication, the documents represented by these exhibits were the subject of Judge Trager's October 6, 2010 Order. Furthermore, these documents were produced by Defendant itself during discovery and are part of the case file. As such, the Court can take judicial notice that these were the documents produced by Defendant. As to relevance, these exhibits are relevant to the issue of credibility and equitable tolling. In addition to the standard equitable tolling analysis, Plaintiff also argues that equitable tolling should be imposed for the entire period of his employment as a sanction for Defendant's conduct concerning the wage poster after the Court receives the evidence at trial. Because Plaintiff was claiming equitable tolling beginning in and around 1996/997 depending on the two or three year SOL, Defendant produced this 1996 FLSA wage poster which it said was found hanging in the basement of the building where Plaintiff worked. The whole purpose of producing this 1996 poster was to represent that the poster notified Plaintiff of his rights from 1996 to the end of his employment in 2009 in an attempt to defeat Plaintiff's equitable tolling argument. However, there is evidence and circumstances (as detailed in Plaintiff's September 24, 2010 motion) which indicate that this poster was hung and photographed after this case was commenced and probably during the discussions about equitable tolling that were ongoing at the time this poster was produced. In his October 6, 2010 Order, Judge Trager gave Defendant a chance to prove that the production and use of this poster was not fraudulent by directing Defendant to answer six specific questions propounded by the Court. The Court directed that all

questions be answered under oath in affidavit form but all we got was an unsworn letter from defendant's counsel stating it cannot answer any of the questions asked by the Court. One of the questions asked Defendant for someone to identify "the location, or locations where this poster was displayed in the subject building during plaintiff's employment." Of all the people who worked and work for Defendant, Defendant could find no one who saw this 1996 wage poster in any location during Plaintiff's employment. Likewise, Plaintiff will testify that during his employment with Defendant this wage poster was never displayed anywhere in the building or in the basement of the subject building as Defendant represented by the production of this poster. Unless a ghost secretly purchased and erected this poster during Plaintiff's employment and then hid it from Plaintiff and Defendant's other employees, it is obvious that the attempt to represent that this poster was displayed during Plaintiff's employment constituted a fraud on the Court and that this poster was most likely erected and photographed after Plaintiff's employment ended in an attempt to defeat Plaintiff's equitable tolling argument.

#### 3. THE APARTMENT-RELATED EXHIBITS ARE ADMISSIBLE

Plaintiff's exhibit 3 consists of "wage, apartment/utilities documents produced during discovery." As to these documents, Plaintiff states in the pre-trial order that it reserves the right to object to them on the basis of relevance. This potential objection is without merit. Defendant has asserted as its ninth affirmative defense in this case that the value of lodging and utilities should be counted as part of Plaintiff's wages. Defendant has also advocated this position throughout this litigation and highlighted the apartment provided to Plaintiff in its pre-trial memorandum. Plaintiff concurs and intends to include the value of the apartment and utilities as part of wages for purposes of calculating overtime under the FLSA. In this regard, the FLSA at 29 CFR § 778.116 states in relevant part that:

Where, for example, an employer furnishes lodging to his employees in addition to cash wages the reasonable cost or the fair value of the lodging (per week) must be added to the cash wages before the regular rate is determined.

As such, the apartment and utility records are extremely relevant and clearly admissible.

## IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff kindly request that your Honor overrule the objections of Defendant and admit all of Plaintiff's proposed exhibits into evidence.

Dated: Queens Village, New York March 17, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Abdul Hassan
Abdul K. Hassan, Esq. (AH6510)
215-28 Hillside Avenue
Queens Village, NY 11427
Tel: 718-740-1000
Counsel for Plaintiff Joseph Daniels

cc: Defense counsel David Kim and Patrick Collins via ECFl



RER In Document 34 of Filed 03/17/11 Case 1:10-cy-00022

Page 9 of 18 The Occupational Safety and Health Act of and healthful working conditions throughout

#### EMPLOYERS

All employers must furnish to employees emplo of employment tree from recognized hazards that i likely to cause death or serious harm to employees comply with occupational salety and health standard

#### **EMPLOYEES**

Employees must comply with all occupational s standards, rules, regulations and orders issued under t to their own actions and conduct on the on-

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration U.S. Department of Labor has the primary responsibility ing the Act. OSHA issues occupational satisfy and he and its Compliance Safety and Health Officers conduct tions to help ensure compliance with the Act.

### INSPECTION

The Act requires that a representative of the employs santative authorized by the employees be given an o accompany the DISHA inspector for purpose of aiding the

Where there is no authorized employee representati Compilance Officer must consult with a reasonable numb ees concerning safety and health conditions in the workpla

#### COMPLAINT

Employees or their representatives have the right to plaint with the nearest OSHA office requesting an insper believe unsafe or unhealthful conditions exist in their workp will withhold, on request, names of employees complaining.

The Act provides that employees may not be discharcriminated against in any way for filing salery and health co for otherwise exercising their rights under the Act.

Employees who believe they have been discriminated a file a complaint with their nearest OSHA office within 30 d alleged discriminatory action.

#### CITATION

If upon inspection OSHA believes an employer has vio Act, a citation alleging such violations will be issued to the a Each citation will specify a time period within which the alleged

The OSHA citation must be prominently deplayed at or place of alleged violation for three days, or until it is corrected, er is later, to warn employees of dangers that may exist there.

Your Rights Under the Fair Labor Standards Act

# **Federal Minimum Wage**

Employees under 20 years of age may be paid \$4.25 per hour during their first 90 consecutive calendar days of employment with an employer

Certain full-time students, student learners, apprentices, and workers with disabilities may be paid less than the minimum wage under special certificates issued by the Department of Labor.

**Tip Credit** 

Employers of "tipped employees" must pay a cash wage of at least \$2.13 per hour if they claim a tip credit against their minimum wage obligation. If an employee's tips combined with the employer's cash wage of at least \$2.13 per hour do not equal the minimum hourly wage, the employer must make up the difference. Certain other conditions must also be met.

Overtime Pay At least 1½ times your regular rate of pay for all hours worked over 40 in a workweek.

Child Labor

An employee must be at least 16 years old to work in most non-farm jobs and at least 18 to work in non-farm jobs declared hazardous by the Secretary of Labor Youths 14 and 15 years old may work outside school hours in various non-manufacturing, non-mining, non-hazardous jobs under the following conditions:

· 3 hours on a school day or 18 hours in a school week;

· 8 hours on a non-school day or 40 hours in a non-school week.

Also, work may not begin before 7 a.m., or end after 7 p.m., except from June 1 through Labor Day, when evening hours are extended to 9 p.m. Different rules apply in agricultural employment.

Enforcement

The Department of Labor may recover back wages either administratively or through court action, for the employees that have been underpaid in violation of the law. Violations may result

Fines of up to \$10,000 per violation may be assessed against employers who violate the child labor provisions of the law and up to \$1,000 per violation against employers who willfully or repeatedly violate the minimum wage or overtime pay provisions. This law prohibits discriminating against or discharging workers who file a complaint or participate in any proceedings under the

- · Certain occupations and establishments are exempt from the minimum wage and/or
- · Special provisions apply to workers in American Samoa.
- · Where state law requires a higher minimum wage, the higher standard applies.

For Additional Information, Contact the Wage and Hour Division office nearest you - listed in your telephone directory under

The law requires employers to display this poster where employees can readily see it.

U.S. Department of Labor Employment Standards Administration Wage and Hour Division Washington, D.C. 20210



# Google maps

Directions to 140 St Edwards St, Brooklyn, NY 11201 3.8 mi – about 12 mins

You can enter notes here.

Save trees. Go green!

Download Google Maps on your phone at google.com/gmm

Save trees. Go green!

Download Google Maps on your phone at **google.com/gmm** 



1710 Union St, Brooklyn, NY 11213

1.	Head east on Union St toward Utica Ave	go 108 ft total 108 ft
<b>1</b> 2	Take the 1st left onto Utica Ave About 2 mins	go 0.7 mi total 0.7 mi
<b>أ</b> 3.	Turn left at <b>Atlantic Ave</b> About 5 mins	go 2.0 mi total 2.7 mi
<b>ሶ</b> 4	Turn right at Vanderbilt Ave	go 0.1 mi total 2.8 mi
<b>أ</b> 5.	Take the 1st left onto <b>Fulton St</b> About 2 mins	go 0.6 mi total 3.4 mi
<b>P</b> 6.	Turn right at <b>Ashland PI</b> About 1 min	go 0.3 mi total 3.7 mi
<b>7</b> .	Turn right at the 2nd cross street onto Willoughby St	go 397 ft total 3.8 mi
<b>5</b> 8.	Willoughby St turns left and becomes St Edwards St Destination will be on the left	go 233 ft total 3,8 mi
140	St Edwards St, Brooklyn, NY 11201	the same the

These directions are for planning purposes only. You may find that construction projects, traffic, weather, or other events may cause conditions to differ from the map results, and you should plan your route accordingly. You must obey all signs or notices regarding your route

Map data ©2011 Google

Directions weren't right? Please find your route on maps.google.com and click "Report a problem" at the bottom left.



Directions to 1710 Union St, Brooklyn, NY 3.9 mi - about 13 mins

You can enter notes here.

Save trees. Go green

Download Google Maps on you phone at google.com/gmm

Save trees. Go green Download Google Maps on your phone at google.com/gmm



## 140 St Edwards St, Brooklyn, NY 11201

	1.	Head north on St Edwards St toward Myrtle Ave	go 322 ft total 322 ft
P	2.	Take the 1st right onto <b>Myrtle Ave</b> About 2 mins	go 0.6 mi total 0.6 mi
r	3.	Turn right at <b>Washington Ave</b> About 5 mins	go 1.5 mi total 2.2 mi
4	4.	Turn left at Eastern Pkwy About 4 mins	go 1.5 mi total 3.7 mi
7	5.	Turn right at Schenectady Ave	go 348 ft total 3.7 mi
1	6.	Turn left at <b>Union St</b> Destination will be on the right	go 0.1 mi total 3.9 mi
<b>P</b> 1	71	I0 Union St, Brooklyn, NY 11213	

These directions are for planning purposes only. You may find that construction projects, traffic, weather, or other events may cause conditions to differ from the map results, and you should plan your route accordingly. You must obey all signs or notices regarding your route.

Map data ©2011 Google

Directions weren't right? Please find your route on maps google.com and click "Report a problem" at the bottom left.

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK				
JOSEPH DANIELS,	10-CV-0022 (DGT) (RER)			
Plaintiff,				
-against-				
1710 REALTY LLC, a/k/a 1710 REALTY ASSOCIATES,				
Defendant.				
X				

### DEFENDANT'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL INITIAL DISCLOSURES

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1), Defendant 1710 REALTY LLC, a/k/a 1710 REALTY ASSOCIATES, by its attorneys McCarter & English, LLP, hereby makes the following supplemental initial disclosures.

# A. DISCLOSURE 26(a)(1)(A)(i)

The name and, if known, the address and telephone number of each individual likely to have discoverable information - along with the subjects of that information -that the disclosing party may use to support its claims or defenses, unless the use would be solely for impeachment.

Aron Sicherman
 c/o Sicherman Management LLC
 1451 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, Brooklyn, New York 11219

Mr. Aron Sicherman has knowledge regarding the existence and location of a U.S.

Department of Labor poster, WHD-1088, in plaintiff's work area at the premises known as 1710

Union Street, Brooklyn, New York 11213. Mr. Aron Sicherman should be contacted through

Defendant's counsel only.

Dated: New York, New York September 17, 2010

McCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP

By:

Patrick M. Collins David S. Kim 245 Park Avenue New York, NY 10167 212-609-6800

Attorneys for Defendant

TO: Abdul K. Hassan, Esq. 215-28 Hillside Avenue

Queens Village, New York 11427

718-740-1000

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Page 1 of 1

# Case 1:10-cv-00022-RER Document 34 Filed 03/17/11 Page 16 of 18 PageID #: 260

Subject: RE: Daniels v. 1710

From: "Collins, Patrick" < PCollins@mccarter.com>

Date: Mon, September 20, 2010 8:55 am

To: abdul@abdulhassan.com

Ce: "Kim, David" <dkim@mccarter.com>

Priority: Normal

Options: View Full Header | View Printable Version | Download this as a file

#### Mr. Hassan:

Please note that we will also be supplementing our document production with a copy of the WH poster posted in the basement of 1710 Union St., as soon as we receive same (which I expect to be in the next day or so). In the meantime, attached for your information are two photographs of the poster.

I agree that we need to speak, but today will be difficult for me due to my schedule. In any event, I will try to reach you no later than tomorrow.

#### Regards,

Patrick M. Collins
McCarter & English, LLP
245 Park Avenue, NY, NY 10167
T: 212-609-6849
F: 646-224-5555
pcollins@mccarter.com | www.mccarter.com

----Original Message----

From: Abdul K. Hassan, Esq. [mailto:abdul@abdulhassan.com]

Sent: Sunday, September 19, 2010 5:25 PM

To: Collins, Patrick

Cc: abdul@abdulhassan.com; Kim, David

Subject: Re: Daniels v. 1710

#### Mr. Collins:

I will be filing a motion to preclude your beyond last-minute witness  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$ 

- Aron Sicherman, and possibly for other relief. I would like to speak with you before filing the motion so please call after on Monday to discuss. We also must file the joint pre-trial order by October 4, 2010 - which has now been complicated by your last purported witness.

#### Abdul.



November 4, 2010

### VIA E-MAIL

Abdul K. Hassan, Esq. 215-28 Hillside Avenue Queens Village, New York 11427

Re: Daniels v. 1710 Realty LLC

Civil Action No.: 10-cv-0022 (DGT) (RER)

David S. Kim Associate T. 212.609.6819 F: 646.328.3269

dkim@mccarter.com

Dear Mr. Hassan:

Defendants will not be submitting to you an affidavit regarding the wage poster found at the premises known as 1710 Union Street, Brooklyn, New York 11213. After diligent investigation, defendants have not located an individual with personal knowledge as to the categories of information listed in the Court's Order dated October 6, 2010.

McCarter & English, LLP 245 Park Avenue 27th Floor New York, NY 10167-0001 T, 212.609.6800 F, 212.609.6921 www.mccarter.com

Therefore, defendants will not be producing any witness with respect to the wage poster.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely.

David S. Kim

BOSTON

cc: Patrick M. Collins

HARTFORD

**NEW YORK** 

NEWARK

**PHILADELPHIA** 

STAMFORD

WILMINGTON